APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/597,047	07/10/2006	Wilhelmus Josephus Bronnenberg	NL040009	5252

24737   7590   04/13/2009
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER
JOHN, CLARENCE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2443	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/13/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		10/597,047	BRONNENBERG ET AL.
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		CLARENCE JOHN	2443	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>14 January 2009</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-11</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-11</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. This action is responsive to amendment filed on January 14, 2009 where the
   applicant amended claims 1 and 11. Claims 1-11 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed on January 14, 2009 have been fully considered but
   they are not persuasive and do not place the Application in condition for
   allowance.

3. With respect to Claim 1and 11, the Applicant argues that the prior arts of record
   fail to teach or suggest all of the elements of the Applicant's invention, such as
   "periodically filtering said information by removing information about content,
   which cannot be rendered by at least one of said network devices adapted for
   rendering content" and "storing said information filtered in a content directory and
   making said information stored available on the network".

4. **In reply,** The Examiner disagrees and states that with respect to Claim 1 and 11,
   the combination of Theriault and Hughes do teach the above limitations.
   Theriault teaches filtering said information by removing information about content
   (Column 5, lines 6-9 and lines 13-17) which cannot be rendered by at least one
   of said network devices adapted for rendering content (Here, the query and
   response cannot be rendered to the network device – Browser, because the
   user selects the filtering of services. i.e. filtering said information). Theriault also

teaches storing said filtered information in a content directory and making said

stored information available on the network. (Column 7, lines 17-23, lines 55-58.

That is, storing of the modified response in the proxy server storage device must

include storing of the information in a file system). However, Theriault does not

explicitly state in his teachings about periodic filtering. Conversely, Hughes

teaches incrementing the filter hits during scan interval. (Column 3, lines 38-39,

lines 56-67, Column 5, lines 10-12, Column 10, lines 16-17, Figure 10 – scan

interval of 5 minutes. i.e. the scan interval of 5 minutes is the periodic filtering

set by the Administrator on the Proxy monitor). Hughes further teaches filtering /

attempt to access blocked material (Column 3, lines 55-57. i.e. filtering the

information.

5. Examiner notes that no new matter has been added and that the amended

   claims are rejected based on the references as cited by the previous office

   action.

6. Applicant has failed to clearly point out patentable novelty in view of the state of

   the art disclosed by the references cited that would overcome the 103(a)

   rejections applied against the claims, the rejection is therefore sustained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Deleted: ¶

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1, 5, 6, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Theriault et al. (US 6,049,821) in view of Hughes et al. (US

6,065,055).

8. With respect to Claim 1, Theriault teaches a method of filtering and storing

information about content, which is available on a network device in a network,

wherein said network further comprises network rendering devices adapted for

rendering content, the method comprises the steps of: -

9. filtering said information by removing information about content (Column 5, lines

6-9 and lines 13-17) which cannot be rendered by at least one of said network

devices adapted for rendering content, (Here, the query and response cannot be

rendered to the network device – Browser, because the user selects the filtering

of services. i.e. filtering said information); storing said filtered information in a

content directory and making said stored information available on the network.

(Column 7, lines 17-23, lines 55-58. That is, storing of the modified response in

the proxy server storage device must include storing of the information in a file

system).

10. Theriault does not explicitly state in his teachings about periodic filtering.

11. However, Hughes teaches incrementing the filter hits during scan interval.

(Column 3, lines 38-40, lines 56-67, Column 5, lines 10-12, Column 10, lines 16-

17, Figure 10 – scan interval of 5 minutes. i.e. the scan interval of 5 minutes is

the periodic filtering set by the Administrator on the Proxy monitor). Hughes

further teaches filtering / attempt to access blocked material (Column 3, lines 55-

57. i.e. filtering the information).

12. Therialut and Hughes teach about filtering information on servers and devices. It

would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have combined the teachings of Theriault and Hughes by

modifying the teaching of Theriault in order to secure the network by periodically

filtering and fully block the unapproved sites from the users.

13. With respect to Claim 5, Theriault and Hughes teach the limitation as described

in Claim 1 above.

14. However, Therialut does not explicitly state about teaching filtering and storing

information of content "in predefined time intervals".

15. Conversely, Hughes does in fact teach such a limitation. (Figure 10, Scan

Interval of 5 minutes, Column 5, lines 10-12).

16. See the above discussion in Claim 1.

17. With respect to Claim 6, Theriault and Hughes teach a method according to

claim 1, wherein said method of filtering and storing information about content is

performed when a new network rendering device enters the network. (Theriault's

teachings on Column 5, lines 6-8, lines 13-17. Column 7, lines 17-23, lines 55-

58. Here, the user device selecting the filtering services is the new device
entering the network).

18. With respect to Claim 10, Theriault and Hughes teach a method according to
claim 1, wherein the method further comprises storing said removed information
about content, (Theriault's teachings on Column 7, lines 17-23, lines 55-58,
That is, storing of the modified response i.e., removed information in the proxy
server storage device must include storing of the information in a file system).

19. which cannot be rendered by at least one of said network devices adapted for
rendering content (Theriault's teachings on Column 5, lines 6-8, lines 13-17);
and making said stored information available on the network. (Theriault's
teachings on Column 7, lines 17-23, lines 55-58. That is, storing of the modified
response in the proxy server storage device must include storing of the
information in a file system).

20. With respect to Claim 11, Theriault and Hughes teach a filtering device adapted
for filtering and storing information about content, which is available on a network
device in a network, wherein said network further comprises network rendering
devices adapted for rendering content, the network device further comprises:

21. means for filtering said information by removing information about content,
(Theriault's teachings on content (Column 5, lines 6-9 and lines 13-17);

22. which cannot be rendered by at least one of said network devices adapted for
    rendering content, (Here, the query and response cannot be rendered to the
    network device – Browser, because the user selects the filtering of services. i.e.
    filtering said information);

23. means for storing said filtered information in a content directory and making said
    stored information available on the network. (Column 7, lines 17-23, lines 55-58.
    That is, storing of the modified response in the proxy server storage device must
    include storing of the information in a file system).

24. Theriault does not explicitly state in his teachings about periodic filtering.

25. However, Hughes teaches incrementing the filter hits during scan interval.
    (Column 3, lines 38-40, lines 56-67, Column 5, lines 10-12, Column 10, lines 16-
    17, Figure 10 – scan interval of 5 minutes. i.e. the scan interval of 5 minutes is
    the periodic filtering set by the Administrator on the Proxy monitor). Hughes
    further teaches filtering / attempt to access blocked material (Column 3, lines 55-
    57. i.e. filtering the information).

26. However, Hughes teaches such a limitation.

27. Therialut and Hughes teach about filtering information on servers and devices. It
    would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the
    invention was made to have combined the teachings of Theriault and Hughes by

modifying the teaching of Theriault in order to secure the network by periodically

filtering and fully block the unapproved sites from the users.

28. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

29. over Theriault and Hughes in further view of Abdulrahiman et al. (US

2003/0023671)

30. With respect to Claim 2, Theriault and Hughes teach the limitations as described

in Claim 1. Theriault also teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein

content, which cannot be rendered by a network rendering device comprises

content having a content format. (Theriault's teachings on Column 5, lines 6-8,

lines 13-17; Here, the query and response cannot be rendered to the network

device – Browser, because the user selects the filtering of services. i.e. filtering

said information);

31. However Theriault and Hughes do not explicitly state in their teachings about the

content which is not compatible with the network rendering devices.

32. Abdulrahiman teaches wireless transmission of contents among portable

devices. Abdulrahiman also teaches about the content which is not compatible

with the network rendering devices. (Page 4, paragraph [0038], lines 12-21,

Paragraph [0039], lines 3-5).

33. Therialut, Hughes and Abdulrahiman teach about filtering contents among the
    servers and devices. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in
    the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of
    Therialult, Hughes and Abdulrahiman by modifying the teachings of Theriault
    and Hughes in order to prevent certain data information from being transmitted to
    the destination by following certain supported data formats.

34. With respect to Claim 3, Theriault and Hughes teach the limitations as
    described in Claim 1. Theriault also teaches a method according to claim 1
    wherein content, which cannot be rendered by a network rendering device
    comprises content. (Theriault's teachings on Column 5, lines 6-8, lines 13-17;
    Here, the query and response cannot be rendered to the network device –
    Browser, because the user selects the filtering of services. i.e. filtering said
    information);

35. However, Theriault and Hughes do not explicitly state about teaching a content
    having a transport protocol, which is not compatible with the network rendering
    devices.

36. Abdulrahiman teaches wireless transmission of contents among portable devices
    Abdulrahiman also teaches about a content having a transport protocol. (Page 3,
    paragraph [0030], lines 6-11, Paragraph [0031], lines 5-8. That is, electronic

information transmitted between remote source and proxy via wireless / wire

connection must have a transport protocol).

37. Therialut, Hughes and Abdulrahiman teach about filtering contents among the

servers and devices.   It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in

the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of

Abdulrahiman with Therialult and Hughes and modify the teachings of Theriault

and Hughes in order to prevent certain data information from being transmitted to

the destination by following certain supported data formats.

38. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Theriault

and Hughes in further view of Safadi (US 2003/0126086).

39. With respect to Claim 4, Theriault and Hughes teach the limitations as described

in Claim 1.

40. However, Theriault and Hughes do not explicitly state about teaching a method

according to claim 1, wherein a content having a DRM system, which is not

supported by any of the network rendering devices.

41. Safadi teaches about copy protection of contents and Digital Rights

Management (DRM) over communication network and devices. (Page 2,

paragraph [0021, lines 1-2).

42. Therialut and Hughes teach about filtering content information on servers and

devices. Safadi teaches about copy protection of content information. It would

have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to have combined the teachings of Safadi with Therialult, and Hughes

and modify the teachings of Theriault and Hughes in order to interface with

multiple content providers and provide copy protection of content.

43. Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Theriault and Hughes in further view of Gorman (US 2002/0143780).

44. With respect to Claim 7, Theriault and Hughes teach the limitations as

described in Claim 1. Theriault also teaches a method of filtering (Column 5,

lines 6-8, lines 13-17); and storing information about content is performed .

(Column 7, lines 17-23, lines 55-58. That is, storing of the modified response in

the proxy server storage device must include storing of the information in a file

system).

45. However, Theriault and Hughes do not explicitly state about teaching a content

which is performed when a network rendering device is removed from the

network.

46. Gorman teaches a system and method for filtering and sorting data. Gorman also

teaches about a content which is performed when a network rendering device is

removed from the network. (Page 4, paragraph [0055], lines 12-14 and Figures 4

A and 4B. Here Figures 4A and 4B reflect user deleted criteria from the filter

cells).

47. Therialut and Hughes teach about filtering content information on servers and devices.

48. Gorman teaches a system and method for filtering and sorting data. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Gorman with Therialult and Hughes and modify the teachings of Theriault and Hughes in order to manage the data and filter multiple columns of data grids so that it satisfies the selected filter criteria.

49. With respect to Claim 8, Theriault and Hughes teach the limitations as described in Claim 1. Also, Theriault and Hughes teach a method of filtering (Theriault's teachings on Column 5, lines 6-8, lines 13-17); and storing information about content is performed (Theriault's teachings on Column 7, lines 17-23, lines 55-58) ; for a predefined time interval (Hughes teachings on Figure 10, Scan Interval, Column 5, lines 10-12).

50. However Theriault and Hughes do not explicitly state about filtering which is performed when a network device has been removed.

51. Gorman teaches a system and method for filtering and sorting data. Gorman also teaches about a content which is performed when a network rendering device is removed from the network. (Page 4, paragraph [0055], lines 12-14 and Figures 4 A and 4B. Here Figures 4A and 4B reflect user deleted criteria from the filter cells).

52. See the above discussion in Claim 7.

53. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Theriault
and Hughes in further view of Cheng (US 2002/0078161).

54. With respect to Claim 9, Theriault and Hughes teach the limitations as described
in Claim 1. Theriault also teaches the information about content being available
on a network device is the content information stored by the content directory
service. (Column 7, lines 17-23, lines 55-58. That is, storing of the modified
response in the proxy server storage device must include storing of the
information in a file system).

55. However, Theriault and Hughes do not explicitly state in their teachings wherein
the network is a UPnP network.

56. Cheng teaches about network communication over server and devices in a UPnP
network. (Page 2, paragraph [0018], lines 1-5. Figure 1).

57. Therialut and Hughes teach about filtering content information on servers and
devices over a network. Cheng teaches about network communication in a
UPnP network. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art
at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Cheng
with Theriault, Hughes and modify the teachings of Theriault and Hughes by
employing a UPnP network which is self configuring and has the network
controller which is capable of discovering and controlling other devices.

Conclusion

The above rejections are based upon the broadest reasonable interpretation of
the claims. Applicant is advised that the specified citations of the relied upon prior art, in
the above rejections, are only representative of the teachings of the prior art, and that
any other supportive sections within the entirety of the reference (including any figures,
incorporation by references, claims and /or priority documents) is implied as being
applied to teach the scope of the claims.

Applicant may not introduce any new matter to the claims or to the specification.
For any subsequent response that contains new/amended claims, Applicant is required
to cite its corresponding support in the specification.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time
policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE
MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within
TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not
mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the
shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any
extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of
the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later
than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to CLARENCE JOHN whose telephone number is
(571)270-5937. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri 8:00 am to 5 pm.

   If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, Ms. Tonia Dollinger can be reached on 571-272-4170. The fax phone
number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-
273-8300.

   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the
Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for
published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.
Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.
For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should
you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic
Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a
USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information
system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/CJ/
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2443
4/9/2009

/Tonia LM Dollinger/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2443